

REMARKS

Claims 7 and 14-29 are pending in the applications. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 have been cancelled. Claims 1-6, 9, 11 and 13 have been replaced by new claims 14-22, respectively, for clarity. Claim 7 has been amended. Claims 14-29 are new.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Formal drawings are being submitted with this Amendment. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The abstract stands objected to for being of improper language and format. The abstract has been amended and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The disclosure stands objected to based on informalities. Applicant has amended the specification. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 8 and 9 stand objected to based on informalities. The rejection is moot in view the cancellation of claims 3, 8 and 9.

Claims 1-2 and 7 stand rejected under 35. U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0018672 to Petters et al. ("Petters"). Claim 14, corresponding to cancelled claim 1, recites, inter alia, "first transaction mediator/supplier price table for storing the relationship between the quantity of the product and a price such that the price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the mediator orders a greater quantity from the supplier; second transaction orderer/mediator price table for storing the relationship between the quantity of product and a price such that the price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the at least one orderer orders a greater quantity from the mediator."

Petters fails to disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 14. Independent claim 14 relates to an orderer placing an order from a supplier and a mediator mediating the transaction. Claim 14 provides for a first and second transaction price table, where the "price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the mediator orders a greater quantity from the supplier" and "price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the at least one orderer orders a greater quantity from the mediator." Instead, Petters discloses a seller placing an item for sale on the internet and calculating the seller's price projected price until the seller receives the desired price result. Petters fails to disclose a first and second price tables in which the price per quantity of an item decreases as a larger order is placed either with the mediator by an orderer or with the supplier by a mediator. Accordingly, Petters does not disclose all of the limitations of new independent claim 14. Therefore claim 14 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 7 recites, inter alia, "joining the mediator and the supplier together by a transaction relationship in accordance with a first transaction mediator/supplier price table in which the price per unit quantity of the product becomes cheaper as the mediator orders a larger quantity from the supplier; joining the mediator and a plurality of orderers together by a transaction relationship in accordance with a second transaction orderer/supplier price table in which the price per unit quantity of the product becomes cheaper as the at least one orderer orders a larger quantity from the mediator."

Petters fails to disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 7. Claim 7 relates to a mediator placing a mass order to increase the quantity ordered and thereby decreasing the price per unit. However, Petters fails to disclose this limitation. Instead, Petters discloses a system and method of posting an item for sale by a seller and thereby projecting the price the seller may receive for the item when it is sold and reiterating the processes until the seller achieves the desired price results. The present

invention relates to “joining the mediator and a plurality of orderers together by a transaction relationship in accordance with a second transaction orderer/supplier price table in which the price per unit quantity of the product becomes cheaper as the at least one orderer orders a larger quantity from the mediator.” Accordingly, Petters fails to teach all of the recited claim limitations. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petters in view of U.S. Patent 5,826,244 to Huberman.

New claims 17-19, correspond respectively to claims 4-6, depend from claim 14. For the above mentioned reasons independent claim 14 is patentable over Petters and therefore dependant claims 17-19 are also patentable over Petters. In addition, neither Huberman nor Petters disclose a method for preparing an “image” for printing. Although, Huberman relates to printing services, Huberman fails to disclose the mediator having an “image producing apparatus” for producing the image. Instead in Huberman, the information is transmitted to the seller without an “image producing apparatus” preparing the image. Furthermore, neither reference provides for “first transaction mediator/supplier price table for storing the relationship between the quantity of the product and a price such that the price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the mediator orders a greater quantity from the supplier; second transaction orderer/mediator price table for storing the relationship between the quantity of product and a price such that the price per unit quantity of the product is cheaper as the at least one orderer orders a greater quantity from the mediator.” The combination of these references would fail to form at least these features of the claimed invention. Therefore, claims 17-19 are patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 5-6, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petters in view of Huberman further in view of U.S. Patent 6,330,542

to Sevcik et al ("Sevcik"). Claims 5-6, 11, and 13 correspond to new claims 18-19, 21 and 22, respectively. New claims 18-19, 21 and 22 depend from independent claim 14. For the above mentioned reasons, Petters fails to disclose all of the limitations of independent claim 14 and accordingly, dependent claims 18-19, 21, and 22 are patentable over Petters. Additionally, Huberman and Sevcik fail to disclose the additional limitations of the dependant claims.

Specifically, the Examiner points to Sevcik for providing a design database as claimed in the dependant claims. However, Sevcik fails to provide "a design information database associated with said mediator which includes at least one of the image information and the processing steps" that claim 18 recites. Instead, Sevcik allows for a customer to search and choose from a database of custom features of a printing project but does not provide a database for producing the image for printing from processing steps or image information provided by the orderer. Furthermore, Sevcik fails to provide a system for producing the image for printing as claim 21 recites. Accordingly, dependant claims 18-19, 21, and 22 are patentable for at least the above mentioned reasons.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 785-9700
Attorney for Applicant

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings have been amended to be consistent with the specification. In FIG. 2, 1A was relabeled to 10A and 9A was relabeled to 17. An annotated sheet showing the amendments is attached. Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1 and 2 are also attached.

FIG. 2

